GPO's Promotion and Advertising Branch Can Help You!

● The Office of Marketing is now the Promotion and Advertising Branch.

● The Depository Library Promotional Materials Order Form has been revised. Each library should receive copies this month. New to the form are revised Print PSA's (public service announcements) and a scanned Depository Logo on diskette. The order forms are being placed in outgoing shipments. Keep your eye out for it!

● Conducting a conference? Being interviewed? Interested in community outreach? The Promotion and Advertising Branch is available to assist you. We've developed general talking points and media relations guidelines that will enhance a presentation of any form. If you're developing something specific to your library and would like our input, just call.

● We loan the VHS videotape of "Keeping America Informed." The tape runs 10:40 minutes and the Depository Library version of the tape runs 4:48 minutes. We also have a portable exhibit available for loan.

● Your primary contact for promotional services is Vicki Barber. Vicki can be reached at:

> Superintendent of Documents
> Promotion and Advertising Branch
> Mail Stop: SM
> Washington, DC 20401
> (202) 512-1712
> Fax: (202) 512-1656

Summary of the Depository Library Council Meeting
Clackamas, Oregon

October 24 - 26, 1994

The Fall 1994 Depository Library Council (DLC) Meeting was held October 24-26, 1994 at the Monarch Hotel and Convention Center, Clackamas, Oregon. Council members in attendance were: Jack Sulzer, Chair; Cynthia Etkin, Secretary; Dan Clemmer; Dave Hoffman; Judith Rowe; Linda Kennedy; Dan O'Mahony; Wilda Marston; Bobby Wynn; Susan Dow; Phyllis Christenson; Jan Fryer; Steve Hayes; and Maggie Parhamovich.

Monday, October 24, 1994

Welcoming Remarks

The Chair, **Jack Sulzer**, called the 45th meeting of the DLC to order, went over the agenda, and introduced the members of the DLC and the GPO staff. He then introduced **Michael F. DiMario**, Public Printer of the United States, who made opening remarks. He spoke of the importance of moving the DLC meetings around the country, stating that it helps us keep sight of our purpose. These meetings provide an opportunity for interaction with working depository librarians, which is very important. While Mr. DiMario praised the electronic information environment, he suggested that caution be taken and warned that we must keep sight of what we do. We inform the nation. We don't want to get so involved in electronic information that we find we are actually taking information away from the public, the public that is not yet capable of handling electronic information.

Mr. DiMario introduced **Shirley Woodrow**, Joint Committee on Printing (JCP) staff, who welcomed everyone to the Northwest and brought greetings from Senator Mark Hatfield (OR) and Senator Ted Stevens (AK). She reminded us that depository libraries and the DLC are part of the Congressional family; and members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on Libraries consider depository librarians their librarians. Yet, depository librarians have a responsibility to keep Congress informed about depository libraries and related issues so they are not taken for granted.

GPO Update

Wayne Kelley, the Superintendent of Documents, pointed out that Internet and Reinvention are receiving great coverage from the mass media, creating high expectations. We're told that the information superhighway will promote education, reduce crime, boost the economy and provide jobs. All Federal agencies are now seeking to reinvent themselves by cutting costs, improving customer service, and streamlining operations. In most cases they end up doing the same thing but emphasis is placed on how they are doing it. True reinvention provides something new, not doing old work a new way. GPO is reinventing its ability to deliver the information customers want, when they want it, and in usable formats. GPO wants to serve more customers with more information, not less. Resources should be allocated to invent the future, not to reinvent the past. Mr. Kelley's remarks then turned to the storage facility for electronic government information. He reported that a business plan is

being written for the facility that will define who are we serving and what the product is. An initial problem is that other agencies do not want to let go of their information. They are looking at information as a commodity from which they can make money, therefore there is not a perceived need for the facility. Because preservation is of interest, the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) was contacted. Right now they only want ASCII format, but at the same time they are asking that bulletin board information be preserved and electronic images be preserved. Folks at NARA believe there is a role for the storage facility and encouraged GPO to take on this intermediary role. NARA also mentioned the concern for standards for electronic information. The vision for the storage facility is to ensure the integrity and permanence of information, and still make it available to customers. The marketing plan and a position description for a manager of the facility will be available by the end of the year. The manager will have to have technical and marketing expertise, will work within EIDS and the FDLP, and will establish and maintain a relationship with NARA.

Wayne described the National Technical Information Service's (NTIS) beta test system, NTIS Preview. This is available on the WWW using Mosaic software. Through this system librarians will be able to identify and NTIS will make available to depository libraries copies of scientific and technical documents not received through the FDLP. NTIS anticipates receiving about 150,000 science and technical documents from agencies per year. NTIS received $8,000,000 for equipment to scan documents that are not in electronic form (98%). Before the money was disbursed, they were told to cooperate with GPO to avoid duplication. GPO suggested that the scanned electronic images be transferred to the storage facility. The response was that they would be compressed format and depositories won't be able to use them in a timely fashion. NTIS Preview will provide an abstract, and upon request from a depository library, a microfiche or paper copy will be provided. GPO believes that in this instance the customer is not being served. NTIS had offered GPO a fiche copy of reports that they could reproduce and distribute to depository libraries. This is not acceptable to GPO either, as they would then be placed in a position of doing what current law says agencies should be doing. Council was asked to monitor NTIS Preview to find out how useful the system is and to rate the usefulness of the document itself. At present 38 depository libraries have signed up to use the system. GPO wants to cooperate with NTIS and predicts that eventually this will happen.

Jay Young, Director of Library Programs Service, reported the results of the Electronic Capabilities Survey that was conducted in July and August of 1994. There was an 82.9% response rate (1153 of 1391 libraries), including all regional depository libraries. Only Federal agency libraries, Federal court libraries, and special libraries responded at a rate lower than 75%. Only 7% of the respondents indicated that they had no PC available for public use. When asked about daily use of electronic products, 76% of all respondents indicated that they had daily usage. Results indicated that CD-ROM products have become routine in depositories, with 98% of the regional libraries, 95% of the academic libraries, and 86% of the public libraries making CD-ROMs available to the public. While 80% of the respondents have Internet access, only 37% provide this access to the public. Sixty-three per cent of the respondents indicated that they subscribe to GOVDOC-L. Although only 37% reported they loaded cataloging tapes into their OPAC, 51% reported having a CD-ROM version of the Monthly Catalog. Because of the rapidly changing environment, another electronic capabilities survey will be conducted next fall. Jay commended depository

libraries for rising to the electronic challenge and warned that format choices for documents are bound to disappear, as GPO Access is to be funded out of cost savings.

Sheila McGarr, Chief of Depository Services, presented a history of depository inspections. Looking toward the future, she then provided the DLC with a draft version of a self-study that depository librarians would complete prior to the on-site inspection. The advantages of the self-study were pointed out: documents staff could review what they are doing and have the opportunity to make alterations to come into compliance prior to the inspection and thus there would be fewer surprises during the inspection; self-study would be a strategic assessment document to steer librarians toward issues that need careful consideration (e.g. ADA compliance and collection development policies); and the self-study could become an ongoing process to assist documents librarians. Should the self-study be adopted, librarians would be contacted three months in advance of the inspection and asked to submit the self-study to GPO six weeks prior to the site visit. The inspector would confirm the self-study and indicate any action that should be taken. The inspector would still have the regulatory role to identify strengths and weaknesses in the depository operations; the educational role to act as a consultant; and a communications role, as the on-site audit is often the only time some documents staff interact with GPO. Sheila sought Council's advice as to whether the self-study should be adopted.

Robin Haun-Mohamed, Chief of the Depository Administration Branch (DAB), reported that DAB staff monitor GOVDOC-L and answer inquiries posted to GOVDOC-L, when appropriate, while continuing to answer written inquiries submitted to GPO on the inquiry form. DAB is also working on implementing the recommendations from the Item Selection Report. Additionally, a survey is being developed for regionals that would allow them to de-select a format for publications distributed in multiple formats.

Given financial constraints, cost of multiple formats, and the fact that electronic products usually offer more information than their paper counterpart, it is GPO's intent to begin enforcing the one copy distribution requirement. Robin requested Council's assistance in making decisions about products that duplicate many titles (e.g. NTDB and Federal Bulletin Board) and not offering publications in multiple formats. A consistent policy for distribution of materials in multiple formats for selective and regional libraries is needed.

Fugitive electronic documents have been explored. Reasons given by agencies for excluding from the depository program include: use of proprietary software, copyrighted materials, or a determination by the agency that the title is self-sustaining (e.g. Federal Reserve Bulletin and New Serial Titles).

Fiscal year 95 appropriations nearly mandated that the United States Code be distributed to depositories in CD-ROM format only. DAB will be working with the Law Revision Council and Electronic Information Dissemination Service to improve the CD version of the U.S. Code, anticipating that it will be distributed in electronic format only in the year 2000.

Robin reported that a Serial Set Study Group was established in June 1994 and charged with investigating alternatives to the bound Serial Set (SS) and reducing its cost. Their report was submitted to the Public Printer in October. Recommendations include implementation of action items: development of a CD-ROM version of the SS, production of the requisite copies

on-demand at the time of binding instead of storing extra copies, and modification of current binding procedures. The Group's recommended actions provide the optimal approach for achieving the objectives without adversely affecting public access to SS information. There are near-term, mid-term, and long-term measures for improving operations while taking advantage of information technologies and reducing costs. Near-term actions include distribution of microfiche index dividers to only those libraries that select them, switching binding procedures from manual flow to machine flow, and libraries' voluntary deselection of paper and microfiche slips when they are available through the GPO Access server. Mid-term actions include the development of a CD-ROM by the end of the 104th Congress and discontinuation of the microfiche format when an electronic version is available. Long-term actions include production of a CD-ROM version of the SS for the 105th Congress (depositories will be able to select bound SS or CD, not both), production of the microfiche SS will cease, and the feasibility and practicality of discontinuing depository distribution of the slip reports and documents will be assessed. A copy of the report was distributed to Council members and they were asked to provide comments.

Tad Downing, Chief of the Cataloging Branch, reported on activities relating to the Monthly Catalog (MoCat) and the GPO Locator. The initial six months of complete MoCat records will soon be supplemented with an additional five months of records. It is expected that when the Locator is operational there will be monthly loads of MoCat and DDIS data, with the ultimate goal being daily loads of MoCat records.

Before proceeding with the production of a CD-ROM version of the Monthly Catalog, Tony Zagami, GPO's General Counsel, was consulted. In his opinion, the Superintendent of Documents may order the production and distribution of the MoCat in a CD-ROM version, but a paper edition would have to be produced as well because of the wording of §1711. LPS is considering a CD-ROM MoCat within the context of the following premises: it is essential to assure that records are available for posterity and provide a permanent record of cataloging activity for a specific period of time; MARC records by GPO and non-MARC records by other agencies would be included; all records will be complete records; and it would be less expensive to produce than the current edition of the paper MoCat. Mike Bright, EIDS, has provided an analysis of CD-ROM MoCat cost estimates. Steve Uthoff has prepared "Data Elements To Be Included in Future Issues of the Printed Monthly Catalog." Implementation of any of these initiatives would be worthwhile and should result in improved products, increased dissemination, and reduced costs.

Gil Baldwin, Senior Program Analyst, reported on the expanded availability of GPO Access to the public. Since the GPO Electronic Access Act was passed, a major goal has been to provide GPO electronic information to the widest audience possible. To achieve this goal, GPO is expanding the number of databases available through GPO Access and actively providing public outreach. The complete Congressional Bills database has replaced the enrolled bills. The History of Bills database has been added to the Congressional Record database, and the Unified Agenda has been added to the Federal Register database. An online users manual has been added as well.

To increase public access, the restriction of one IP address or one SWAIS user id per depository is being changed to any combination of SWAIS and WAIS subscriptions, not to exceed ten. Along with providing these services, depositories must make six basic

commitments: libraries that receive additional pre-paid subscriptions must provide service to the general public, just as they would any other information disseminated through the FDLP; any depository may register up to ten subscriptions for each of the three item numbers at no extra charge to the library and a workstation may be a server, if no more than ten simultaneous users will be accessing GPO's WAIS server; a depository may register for either SWAIS, WAIS, or a combination of both interfaces, not to exceed ten to access; participating libraries must ensure the same level of service and user support is made available to the general public as to the library's primary constituents; and depositories are expected to provide the first line of user support for the GPO Access services.

The model gateway project is available to libraries that want to offer public access to the GPO Access services to off-site users. In this instance the campus or local network server is connected via the Internet to GPO's WAIS server. The first site to offer this was the Columbia Online Information Network (COIN) in Columbia, Missouri. The University of Missouri allocated some of its GPO Access user IDs to COIN, creating the first virtual housing agreement. Seattle Public Library was the second gateway to become operational. These two sites provide the SWAIS interface. The University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill is developing a server client that can access WAIS but does not require WAIS client software at the user end. GPO has a goal of providing at least one gateway in every state. There are two additional requirements for gateway libraries. They must offer all of the GPO Access services. To make the transformation to a gateway easier, they should already have had experience with the services for on-site users.

GPO is streamlining the registration process. The authorization letter is being replaced by a fax-in form. Registration confirmation notices will now be sent. Because the system is growing incrementally, a memory upgrade has been installed on the original server and a complete backup server is being assembled so that service is uninterrupted if the primary server goes down. The backup server will also provide a platform for installing test software enhancements or new databases without affecting the performance of the live system.

Judy Russell, Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Service Director, announced that other databases are pending for inclusion in the GPO Access services: Public Laws, Congressional reports, Code of Federal Regulations, GAO Reports, and the United States Code. Database improvements under development are changing the headers to include page numbers and allowing legal cite retrieval. Judy asked for Council's input as to whether page numbering should begin in November 1994 or January 1995. Council was also asked for advice on how to tag deleted and inserted text into the ASCII text version of the Congressional bills. She also announced that a survey will be e-mailed to bills database subscribers, seeking additional comments on this issue. Sample databases have been developed so that the services may be tried prior to purchase. Telnet to wais.gpo.gov and login as sample (lower case). A sample database will also be available through the GPO Home Page which is currently under construction.

Other projects of EIDS are updating the PRF in the Locator on a daily basis and investigating the possibility of a CD-ROM of all Congressional bills, since PDF files are available, for depository libraries. Acrobat standard low-end reader software is available for free downloading from the Federal Bulletin Board. It is also available on some CDs that have been distributed through the FDLP (Tax form, NESE with the budget, FAR/FIRMR).

Version 2.0 of the software allows an index to be generated from the PDF files, allowing greater access to information on the CD. This will be used on the new tax form CD and it is this software that will probably be used on the bills CD.

Training is a very big issue. GPO staff cannot get everywhere, so a "Train the Trainers" program of sorts must be used. Judy is very interested in feedback as to what depository librarians' training needs are. GPO can provide slides, scripts for searches, and a user's manual.

Council Business

Election of Assistant Chair/Chair-elect. Linda Kennedy nominated Dan O'Mahony for Assistant Chair/Chair-elect. Maggie Parhamovich was the second. With no other nominations, Dan was elected by acclamation. Dan will begin to assist Jack after this meeting and take over as Chair of Council after the Spring 1995 meeting.

ALA GODORT Chair Mary Redmond discussed some of the long-range projects of GODORT. A list of fugitive documents is being compiled for a hearing. At the request of the ALA Washington Office, an examination of Title 44 will be undertaken. As Chair of the Legislation Committee, Linda Kennedy will head up this project. Marketing techniques for the FDLP will be investigated. GODORT has been given time for an open forum at Federal Depository Annual Conference, 1995. This will be an opportunity to talk to colleagues in other associations to come up with possible collaborative projects and coalition building. Specific short-term projects are: response to OMB GILS, Arthur Curley's letter comments on NII, and a letter to President Clinton. GODORT invites volunteers and participants.

Linda Kennedy presented the report of the **Operations Committee**. Members of the Committee are Cindy Etkin, David Hoffman, and Linda Kennedy. Membership on this committee was solicited, noting that it would be nice to have someone involved in the day-to-day operations of a depository library on the committee. Committee members have been monitoring GOVDOC-L. Internet access at GPO has allowed LPS staff to monitor GOVDOC-L and they have been responding in a timely matter to concerns that have been posted. The LPS Update has addressed many issues. It was announced that there has been a reduction in the backlog of inquiries, from 1000 to 200. It was clarified that GPO does follow-up with agencies on "Whatever happened to..." inquiries. Sometimes this takes a long time and it would be helpful if there were a mechanism that informs librarians of the progress of their inquiry. It seems as though there is a lengthy conversion and turn around time for fiche production. Robin explained that microfiche contract specifications say that they have 15 days, after pick-up, to complete a job. Lengthy delays are from the agency, prior to sending the material to the microfiche contractor. The possibility of CD-ROM of FBIS was mentioned. A concern was raised over the abbreviations used in microfiche headers, who enters them and are standard abbreviations used? Some headers are incomprehensible because of all the abbreviations used. It was asked if there was data available on the accuracy of fiche shipments and claims by contractor. Seventy-five percent of fiche is produced by Microform and there have been significant problems with claims. Regional depository microfiche shipments are now being monitored 100%. If problems continue, contact Linda Frazier at Microform and/or Robin Haun-Mohamed. LPS Update indicated that LPS will return to the traditional item survey process with clip art cards

provided with item number information, when possible. Robin explained that they were forced to change the process when there was no advance notice for a publication. In these instances the publication is linked to an existing item number and it is noted on the shipping list by an alert in all capital letters. It was also asked that the current practice for series within a series be shared in Administrative Notes.

John and Vickie Phillips have compiled earlier DLC recommendations in an electronic format. Agendas and Council members are also included. John indicated that there were gaps from the first Council meetings of the early seventies, 1981-82, and 1991-92. Volunteers have agreed to fill them. Currently the document is over 400 pages. John indicated that it is the pleasure of Council as to how this information will be disseminated. It was suggested that perhaps they be mounted on the Federal Bulletin Board or at a gopher site.

Dan O'Mahony reported for the **Information Exchange Committee**. Members of the Committee are Dave Hoffman, Dan O'Mahony, Judith Rowe, Jack Sulzer (Council Liaison), and Jay Young (GPO Liaison). The Committee is currently working on three projects. The first, explained in a letter that went to depositories in a regular shipment, is to solicit testimonial letters to continue to document the value of the FDLP. The letters will be used to put a local and human face to the FDLP and be used as a public relations item. Phase II of the testimonial project is to organize a public hearing. The third project is a handbook for new Council members. At this point it is in draft form.

Cindy Etkin reported for the **Monthly Catalog Working Group**. The members of the Working Group are Linda Kennedy, Dave Hoffman, and Cindy Etkin. The charge of this group was to look at how the production costs of the Monthly Catalog can be reduced and to investigate the feasibility of producing the Monthly Catalog in CD format. In May there was a posting on GOVDOC-L to solicit input on these issues. There was little response and there was an intent to repost at a later date. Additionally, questions about the Monthly Catalog and cataloging tape loads were incorporated into the Electronic Capability Survey. In the meantime the memorandum from Tony Zagami was received, which indicated that a paper MoCat would have to be produced. This turned the focus of the Group from the creation of a CD product to what can be done to lessen the cost of the printed MoCat. Again, to solicit input from the depository community, a letter soliciting ideas, thoughts, and concerns went to all depository libraries and a message was again posted on GOVDOC-L. About 50 responses were received. Two major concerns expressed were the unknown life of a CD-ROM and the loss of cataloging data if MoCat entries were shortened. Popular suggestions were to eliminate the number of indexes, specifically the semi-annual indexes, keyword index, and contract/report number index. Other creative suggestions included less white space on the pages, fewer preliminary pages, and smaller print.

Tom Anderson reported for the **Ad Hoc Committee on the Regional Structure**. The Committee was formed in late February 1994 with Gary Cornwell as Chair. Other members of the Committee are Cindy Etkin, Dan O'Mahony, Tom Andersen, Maureen Harris, Greg Lawrence, Paul Pattwell, Sheila McGarr, and Jay Young. The Committee was charged with examining alternatives to the existing Regional system of the FDLP and to develop proposals for new "regionals" or other configurations or networks which may better serve the needs of the Program, libraries, and users of government information. Issue briefs were prepared and

presented at Spring 1994 Depository Library Conference and they generated much discussion. Most of the Committee was at ALA in Miami and the Committee had a chance to meet. Paul and Greg volunteered to write a "vision statement" with three sections: where do we see Regionals in ten years or is there a need for regionals; where we are now and the transition process necessary to reach our "vision," a section that relies heavily on the issue briefs; and short and long-term steps to achieve the "vision." The vision statement is finished, but to date there has been no reaction from the regional community. Gary has suggested that a full day discussion on this topic be arranged for Spring 1995 Council meeting.

Steve Hayes reported for the **Ad Hoc Committee on Restructuring Alternatives Report**. Members of the Committee are Jan Fryer and Steve Hayes (Co-chairs), Phyllis Christenson, Susan Dow, Dan Clemmer, and Maggie Parhamovich. This Committee was charged with reviewing "Alternatives for Restructuring the Depository Library Program" and to bring forward to Council a document to spark discussion or items for action. Members selected, from those reports, what they saw as the five most important elements from their perspective as a "type" of library (agency, academic, law, public, special). The underlying assumptions of the Committee were to limit discussion to those items that are within the purview of the Public Printer, avoid areas already decided by statute or regulation, avoid thorny issues in hopes that other discussion and action would eliminate the thorny issues, and we want to do what we have a long tradition of: provide a structure that is parallel to ink on paper. The Committee sees five areas that need restructuring: goals of the program, depository library program membership, formats included in the program, cooperative/interactive structure of the program (regions and regionals), and dissemination. The work of this Committee and that of the Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure are dovetailing.

Site for Fall 1995 Depository Library Council Meeting. Dan prepared a map which indicates previous meeting sites. Circled cities have hosted more than one meeting. Jack opened up the floor to suggestions. Anchorage, Fargo, Salt Lake City, Kansas City, Nashville, Jackson (WY), Sioux Falls, Research Triangle, Asheville, St. Louis, Little Rock, Reno, St. Paul, Tulsa, Lexington, and others were mentioned. Consider air transportation, the possibility of public hearings, perhaps should choose an area in which there is a Council member to handle the logistics of a hearing, and an area with a large concentration of depositories. A Committee of Bobby Wynn, Wilda Marston, Cindy Etkin, and Dan O'Mahony was formed to provide a short list of meeting locations.

Committee Structure of Council was looked at. After discussion about the differences between work groups and ad hoc committees, it was decided that the only standing committees of Council would be Operations, Information Exchange, and Preservation & Archival Issues. Ad Hoc Committees are Regional Structure and Restructuring Report. The possibility of having non-Council members on committees was raised.

Open Forum

The discussion during the open forum was dominated by electronic information issues. Major concerns were the elimination of selection choices for titles that are available in multiple formats, particularly electronic (CD and online); no CD or online version duplicates a paper version; although the results of the electronic capabilities survey were positive, they are not an indication that depositories are ready to move into an all electronic environment;

the survey results do not indicate that the libraries are where they would like to be electronically; although we answered that technical assistance was available in library, it does not necessarily mean the assistance is "right at hand" and available when users need it; because depositories serve persons with diverse electronic abilities and informational needs, our patrons are not ready for the transformation into an all electronic environment; electronic products must be user friendly before they are forced upon us; GPO was urged to be flexible and not make hasty decisions about replacing sources with electronic versions; electronic products are not conducive to telephone reference service; guidelines or a policy statement for electronic information should be established; training in the use of electronic products was raised as a major concern; people were reminded that GPO does not have jurisdiction over products produced by other agencies, with this in mind, suggestions were made for training for electronic products--GPO could encourage agencies to produce tutorials for their products, the annual depository conference provides an opportunity for agency persons to provide training for their products, agency liaisons could play an active role in training. In addition to electronic information issues, a concern for the representation of public libraries on Council was voiced.

Tuesday, October 25, 1994

Government Printing and Information Dissemination Initiatives Update

Michael DiMario provided a legislative update and insight into the political environment affecting GPO and the Federal Depository Library Program. He indicated that it was a strange year in the legislative process. Mr. DiMario began with an explanation of the National Performance Review Report, H.R. 3400, and S. 1824. It was "a great relief to many of us" when no bill passed the Senate side of Congress. The next hurdle was with the issue of duplicating. GSA, in an independent initiative, alleged that they had independent legal authority and could skirt the mandates of Title 44. The Assistant Attorney General issued an opinion that upheld the language of §207 that requires agencies to go through GPO for printing or else indicate that it is economically feasible to do their own printing and obtain certification from the Public Printer. When GSA asked if this included duplicating, they were told no. The opinion upset the printing industry and ALA. This meant that work being done by GPO through procurement could now be done by agencies, leading to more in-house duplicating and more fugitive documents. In the appropriations bill from the Senate, duplicating was included as part of §207. Duplicating was not included in the House version. After the conference committee met, the bill passed with duplicating language included. The President signed the bill into law but he attached a transmittal message indicating that he viewed the scheme of printing and binding as unconstitutional and agencies would interpret §207 to mean the GPO was a mandatory source only for publications that have public use as their primary purpose. This would lead to additional fugitive documents because the primary purpose of most documents is for the internal activities of government and the distribution to the public is secondary. Although secondary, distribution to the public it is the most critical, because it is the way the American public gets basic information as to what their government is doing. Some viewed this action as a line item veto of sorts. Potential ramifications are enormous.

In summation, we are now facing an election and the faces may change, but the depository world has received much support from the JCP and the Appropriations

Committees. In many ways GPO is stronger because the printing industry, the library community, and the labor forces at the GPO are working together because of the common interest to preserve the government printing process. On the other hand, GPO as an organization has also become the "whipping boy." The legislative branch has the need to reduce itself, particularly in the support agencies. There was a resolution that GPO break even this year and next year. This is a monumental task. But if you look at the tone of government generally, GPO has fared quite well. We are reaching goals and still reducing. Congress is still the senior body. The champions of the library program are growing in number. If we can show the actual uses being made of information flowing through the program, we have the ability to gain much more support. The Public Printer was optimistic and he applauded the efforts that librarians put forth on behalf of their constituencies and the tremendous service that they provide and their volunteerism through associations and organizations that make the process work so well.

Open Forum

The rest of the day was devoted to open forum discussion of various issues. Discussion was divided into specific segments including GPO Access, Format Issues, Regional Restructuring for Electronic Information, and Operational Issues. In the first segment, **GPO Access**, various methods of training were suggested: tutorials, mentoring programs, state and regional organizations could play a role, train the trainers program, cheat sheets, and good documentation. Attempts to communicate with library directors and those with budgetary purse strings was raised as a concern and it was suggested that the minimum technical guidelines be strengthened.

The second discussion segment, **Format Issues**, raised the following concerns: usefulness of the format, informational content, how the product is used, standards, multiple electronic versions (diskette and CD), preservation, user support, reliability of systems, and flexibility during the transition period, timeliness of the information, physical permanence of CDs, and the need for an SOD 13 for electronic products.

Regional Restructuring for Electronic Information was the third discussion segment. Questions, comments, and observations that were made include: we have to move toward the point of all depositories having minimal technical abilities; is referral sufficient; perhaps a minimum would be to be able to use the GPO Locator and be able to use CDs that come with software; is ILL different for electronic products; how can we say we don't select something if it is available to others online; depository librarians must have a threshold level of electronic expertise in order to provide service; library patrons are going to force smaller libraries to enhance their technical capabilities; more electronic products need to be placed on the core list of items to be received by all depository libraries; we need to avoid saying "go electronic or get out of the program;" libraries that cannot support electronic information should be required to seek selective housing agreements; cooperation must be promoted; and libraries may drop out of the depository library program, but others may join as electronic libraries.

The fourth discussion segment dealt with **Operational Issues**. Items discussed included NASA Thesaurus terms for subject headings, the self-study in the inspection process, the future of the Serial Set, new item selections, and elements of the Monthly Catalog.

Another topic that arose was **Gateway Libraries**. Observations and comments included the following: Gateways represent restructuring of the depository program as they provide new cooperative efforts with local officials and other entities besides libraries; Gateways represent a great opportunity to expand the reach of the program; Gateways require a new commitment of institutional resources; software revisions must not lock out clientele that are technological have nots; state plans need to be revised to include electronic information and the possibility of networks; and GPO's vision of what depositories need to be doing in the electronic era needs to be communicated.

Following the Open Forum, Council selected and discussed the issues that would become recommendations and action items for Council to address. Teams were established to provide draft recommendations.

Wednesday, October 26, 1994

Draft versions of the Council's recommendations to the Public Printer were presented and discussed. Action items for Council were also discussed. Committee and Working Group assignments were made:

GPO Operations Committee: Dave Hoffman, Cindy Etkin. Two additional members from outside DLC/GPO membership to be appointed at a later date.

Information Exchange Committee: Dan O'Mahony (Chair), Judith Rowe, Linda Kennedy, Jack Sulzer, Dan Clemmer, Phyllis Christenson, Jay Young (GPO Liaison).

Preservation and Archiving Issues Committee: Dan Clemmer (Chair), Phyllis Christenson, Wilda Marston, Judy Russell (GPO Liaison). Two additional members from outside DLC/GPO membership to be appointed at a later date.

Monthly Catalog Working Group: Dave Hoffman (Chair), Cindy Etkin, Bobby Wynn, Tad Downing (GPO Liaison)

Revision of SOD #13 Working Group: Steve Hayes (Chair), Maggie Parhamovich, Susan Dow, Robin-Haun-Mohamed (GPO Liaison). Plus one member from a Gateway Library to be added at a later date.

Revision of Depository Guidelines Working Group: Jan Fryer (Chair), Susan Dow, Bobby Wynn, Sheila McGarr (GPO Liaison). Three additional members from outside DLC/GPO representing a regional library, a gateway library, and a state library to be named at a later date.

Testimonial Working Group: Cindy Etkin, Judith Rowe, Dan O'Mahony.

Ad Hoc Committee on NTIS Preview: Maggie Parhamovich (Chair), Linda Kennedy, Phyllis Christenson, Jay Young (GPO Liaison). One additional member from outside GPO/DLC to be added at a later date.

Closing Remarks

Mr. DiMario thanked the Council members and all the people who attended the meeting for putting forth great efforts for the depository library program, saying that a healthy exchange of information has taken place at this conference. Each meeting is unique not just because of the rotating membership of Council, but also because of the nature of the audience and the degree to which the audience participates.

Some issues need to be looked at not just from the library organizational structure but from that of the fundamental purpose of the depository program, the nature of selectives, the role of public libraries, and the political element. Congressmen tend to focus on local issues and they need to know what use is being made of the information being distributed to depository libraries. The testimonial project was started with this in mind. To members of Congress, research uses of information provide a less persuasive argument for depositories than delivery of services back home. Depository librarians are a cohesive body that provides GPO with information on how to operate the program. The Public Printer does not want to see divisive issues. He fears that the restructuring issue has the potential for divisiveness and suggested that if you focus on restructuring, focus on it with the sense that you do not want to create two organizations or two advisory bodies. The Depository Library Program is an extension of Congressional services provided to the constituencies and part of the Congressional family. We are very proud of the institution and the great service we provide to the public through the depository program. We want to improve the organization. The electronic age and changes taking place provide a tremendous opportunity to expand service to the public. But we want to be very careful that we do not disenfranchise anyone.

Jack Sulzer thanked Mr. DiMario for bringing us all together. The Chair was pleased with the discussion that the audience provided. It was very valuable to Council as we discussed and considered recommendations. A word of thanks was given to the GPO staff for their participation in the meetings and making all the meeting arrangements. A special thanks was given to Willie Thompson.

Maggie moved, and it was seconded, that the meeting be adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Cynthia Etkin, Secretary
Depository Library Council

DLC Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure, Correction

[The text for the discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee's Operational Issues was submitted to Administrative Notes with the author's names transposed. The texts are reprinted below with correct attribution.]

Operational Issues
Tom Andersen, California State Library

Collection Development:

Except for the recent USGS orthoquad compact discs, Regionals have always been required to receive and permanently retain all items offered through the Federal Depository Library Program. The only items allowed to be discarded are superseded items and one format of an item if the same item is received in more than one format.

As a result, Regionals have to cope with finding sufficient housing (shelving, fiche cabinets, map cabinets, CD cabinets, etc.) to store an always expanding 100% depository collection. Regionals cannot always predict how much expansion space will be needed on a short-term or long-term basis, since the volume of material received is directly related to the ebb and flow of government information (e.g. the huge surge of DOE fiche in the mid-80s). Some Regionals are able to relieve the pressure for space by farming out portions of the depository collection to other libraries via selective housing agreements.

Regionals also need sufficient staff to adequately accession, process, and catalog their complete depository collections. The materials must be retrievable, because Regional collections are expected to be the collection of last resort for their area; likewise, Regionals are expected to keep their depository collections as intact as possible in order to service selective depositories. Regionals are expected to aggressively provide for the binding of appropriate depository materials.

If Regionals continue to receive all items distributed in electronic formats, it will be very difficult for most of them to mount, display, and interpret every item in order to provide public access. It is extremely unlikely that many Regionals will be able to provide complete public access to all the government databases being proposed as depository items, at least for the short term.

Disposition of Government Publications:

A selective depository cannot dispose of any depository publication (except one that has been superseded) without the approval of its Regional. This can be a tremendous burden for many Regionals, especially those with many selectives in their area. Although the idea behind the procedure is to assure that the Regional can fill in any gaps in its collection and then make discarded publications available to other libraries, it can become a major administrative component in a Regional's workflow and demand a substantial amount of professional and clerical staff time.

Depository Inspections:

Regionals are expected to accompany GPO Inspectors on their inspections of selective depositories in their areas. There are obvious benefits -- a greater understanding of specific selective depositories' needs, problems, and accomplishments; the ability to act as an interface between the Inspector and the selective; etc. However, since GPO provides no financial assistance to Regionals to perform this function, it can be very difficult for a Regional to obtain the funding to cover incurred expenses. As with depository disposition problems, the disparity between Regionals -- specifically the size of the Regional area and the number of selectives within the area -- makes for an extremely uneven balance of administrative responsibilities from one Regional to the next. What is an acceptable workload for one Regional can be impossible for another. The result is that selective depositories across the nation receive a wide variety of assistance from their Regionals; likewise, Regionals are not consistent in performing their administrative obligations.

Other Issues:

Will all of the above responsibilities to contend with, it is difficult for many Regionals to adequately deal with the other obligations that are part of Regional designation. Although many do their best to consult with their selectives on a one-to-one basis as needed, there are not always the resources available to construct more formal outreach programs, cooperative plans, etc.

In General:

Regionals are required to do everything selectives do, but on a larger scale, as well as be responsible for obligations required only of Regionals. This is occurring during an extended period of reduced library funding, less staffing, and an overall decline in available resources.

Although Regionals genuinely want to do everything, there is just too much to be done. As the depository system, especially the distribution of government information, has expanded and grown, GPO does not appear to have attempted to reduce Regional responsibilities at all. The latest rounds of inspections indicate that GPO unrealistically expects Regionals to continue doing just as much and in some cases (requiring Regionals to respond to surveys) even more.

Operational Issues
Paul Pattwell, Newark Public Library

It is difficult to discuss operational issues of regional depositories as discrete categories. Discussing any facet of the work leads to a consideration of another. Collection development issues lead to a discussion of staff, physical facilities, bibliographic control, and so on.

Considering the number of years that most libraries have served as depositories, and then as regionals, most meet the determination that a regional is truly a library within a library.

Listed here are some of the major concerns for regionals:

*   Regionals must receive and retain all items offered through the Federal Depository Library Program, unless they are superseded in either print or microfacsimile form.

*   Regionals require additional staff beyond the levels expected of selectives.

*   Regionals must meet the added requirement for INCREASED levels of equipment, training, and in doing so, overcome problems of access for documents on CD-ROM, floppy disks, and other non-traditional formats

*   Regionals are required to provide leadership. Establishing its presence regional staff are expected to provide guidance, provide opportunities for consultation, and accompany GPO inspectors.

*   Regionals must hold all or most documents in perpetuum. Guaranteeing the comprehensiveness and integrity of the state or regions holdings regionals must formulate and administer policies to manage the disposition of unwanted documents. In large depository communities this can present a formidable task.

To alleviate some of the burden regionals may set up separate housing agreements with other institutions.

Finding libraries willing to participate is difficult as was recently demonstrated with USGS digital orthophotoquad compact discs.

Negotiating and administering the agreements bring another dynamic to regional operations.

*   Regionals must assist selectives with reference questions, ILL, and provide some mechanism for photocopies, fiche-to- fiche copies, or floppy disk copies.

*   Regionals are expected to offer workshops and training sessions.

Service philosophy is the underpinning for all that regionals accomplish or offer. It is the nexus for views on staffing, physical facilities, collection development, bibliographic control, maintenance and outreach.

In this regard all regionals are not created equal. The quality and size of the depository community served and the resources a library brings to this effort can affect the service they can offer or provide. Supporting this view is the study of Hernon, et al, which determined that in comparison to public libraries most academic libraries collect about 25% more items and are likely to have access to technology not yet available in public libraries. A regional in a community with mostly academic depositories may have less of role to play in areas affected by these considerations.

On the other hand most service philosophies in academic libraries are designed to meet the research and information needs of faculty, students, staff, and alumni, and then the general public.

The Hernon study also stated that budget allocation for 92.2% of the regionals was over $1 million. Although not stated in the study, unlike regionals in public or special libraries, academic libraries have an indirect cost recovery mechanism available through tuition charges and student fees.

While it is expected that all will compete for grants from the same state or Federal authorities academic libraries are more likely to receive private endowments.

Realistically, local politics and economics force regionals to reinvent requirements and limit the expectations of GPO.

State and public institutions, either by law or policy, have a difficult time of rationalizing operational costs for services provided in support of depositories across states or part of another state. And yet, for the general public, it is these regional types that will most likely meet their government information needs.

Table of Contents